DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 140 358 CS 501 653

AUTHOR Darsey, James
TITLE Escalation of Agitative Rhetoric: A Case Study of Mattachine Midwest, 1967-1970.
PUB DATE 77
NOTE 25p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Central States Speech Association (Southfield, Michigan, April 1977) ; Best Copy Available

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Case Studies; *Civil Rights; *Communication (Thought Transfer); *Homosexuality; Minority Groups; *Rhetoric; *Social Action; Speech Communication

ABSTRACT

This paper examines the adequacy of Bowers and Ochs' theory of social movements as applied to the escalating agitative strategies of a dissident group, the homosexual-rights organization Mattachine Midwest. The group's activities are described chronologically, in terms of the strategies employed: petition, promulgation, polarization, solidification, politicization, coalition, nonviolent resistance, and escalation/confrontation. This sequence is compared to the Bowers and Ochs schema, which is found to remain largely intact. Two of the strategies, politicization and coalition, were not part of the original schema. Limitations and advantages of the Bowers and Ochs' approach are discussed in the light of the results of the case study. (AA)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED140358

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Escalation of Agitative Rhetoric:

A Case Study of Mattachine Midwest, 1967-1970

James Darsey
Dept. of Communication
Purdue University

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
James Darsey

TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Presented to
the Central States Speech Association
Annual Conference
April 15, 1977
Southfield, Michigan

CS 501 453

James Darsey
Dept. of Communication
Purdue University
W. Lafayette, In. 47907

Escalation of Agitative Rhetoric: A Case Study of Mattachine Midwest, 1967-1970.*

If effective theory is to be built, the rhetorical critic must examine rhetorical events against the theoretical frameworks provided in the field in order to test the validity of those frameworks. John Waite Bowers and Donovan J. Ochs presented a theory applicable to social movements in The Rhetoric of Agitation and Control.[1] Last year at this convention, Wayne Weber presented a paper examining the predictive utility of the Bowers and Ochs schema when applied to an instance of conflict resolution.[2] There are several weaknesses in the Weber study. One of the most noted is that the rhetoric of the conflict in question could be studied only as it was reported in the community newspaper, because rhetorical samples derived directly from the movement were not available. Consequently, the rhetorical manifestations of the conflict are at least once removed from the movement itself. In concluding his paper, Weber called for more "investigation into the evalution of many clashes between 'establishments' and dissident groups which must be done before the Bowers and Ochs hypotheses can either be accepted or rejected as predictors of the resolution of a social conflict."[3] This paper attempts to help fill this function by examining the escalating agitative strategies of a dissident group functioning in society.[4]

In addition to the theoretical function, this paper attempts to give insight into a unique movement that has been largely ignored in the rhetorical literature, the contemporary American homophile movement. Only one study was found in communication field which concentrated on homosexuals exclusively, and that on a linguistic level.[5] Even those studies which draw on the homophile movement for data to illustrate larger concepts are infrequent.[6] No studies were found which deal with the movement prior to its militant, prominent gay liberation period or with the transition of the movement to that period, itself an important phenomenon for the student of escalation.

Undoubtedly, much of the reason that this movement has not been exploited by researchers in communication and rhetoric is its relative invisibility. The uniqueness of the homophile movement rests in the fact that it is the movement of the invisible minority, the only minority in this country for whom anonymity is a viable option on a large scale. Because of their ability to conceal their membership in an oppressed group as they move through society, homosexuals are not fighting against deprivation so much as they are fighting for expression. Blacks, women, chicanos, and often Indians are readily identifiable, thus the process of discrimination is generally easy. The problem with homosexuals is not that society has not stigmatized them,[7] but that they cannot be found to be discriminated against. The first Kinsey report revealed the incidence of homosexuality to be of a magnitude that astounded Kinsey himself.[8] In essence, it drew attention to the fact that there was a minority in America "of ten to twenty-five million people, about as large as blacks

and twice as large as Jews,"[9] which is virtually undetectable. This characteristic might be expected to result in some employment of rhetorical strategies in unique ways, especially where identification with the movement is concerned, when all of the benefits of society are gained through non-identification.

An assumption critical to the interpretation of the results of this study is that intra-group rhetoric can provide answers to important questions. Social movements must be understood in terms of their constituencies which form the movement's strategies. In-group rhetoric, where there is open exchange among members of the group that gives rise to strategies is a logical source for understanding the evolution of those strategies. Erving Goffman refers to the role of a publication in a stigmatized group, "which gives voice to shared feelings consolidating and stabilizing for the reader his sense of the realness of 'his' group and his attachment to it. Here the ideology of the members is formulated -- their complaints, their aspirations, their politics."[10] Thus, the in-group publication is evidence of the strategy of solidification as Bowers amd Ochs claim,[11] but it also reflects the other strategies engaged in by the group.

The Bowers and Ochs schema rests on the idea that these group strategies escalate; they grow more radical. Strategies move from petition, or normal discursive means of persuasion, to revolution, or war, in a "cumulative and progressive" manner.[12] This study centers on the period surrounding the Stonewall rebellion in June, 1969 as the period for the homophile movement most likely to conform to this tendency and most likely to exhibit the greatest range of strategies. Before Stonewall, the conservative Mattachine Societies were typical of the state of the movement. These groups were characterized by secrecy and a greater concentration on helping the homosexual wrk within society rather than make wholesale changes in the existing structure. Social gatherings places of gay people, especially bars, bath, and areas in public parks, could be harassed to political advantage without fear of repercussions arising over the abuse of rights. Gay people were too afraid of the consequences of exposure to push it; they were indeed living "in the closet."

On June 28, 1969, those closet doors were opened when the New York City police staged what was meant to be a routine raid on the Stonewall Inn on Christopher Street in Greenwich Village. The Stonewall Inn was a very popular gay bar. Instead of the usual passiveness and submission, the police encountered bottles, rocks, and other forms of physical and verbal resistance. Three nights of street riots followed, and the months after saw Gay Liberation groups springing up all over the country. As some of the Mattachine Midwest descriptions indicate, these groups typically consisted of younger, more radical gays than had been involved in the movement before. This younger group was willing to increase their visibility and engage in strategies which involved marches, pickets, protests, and large-scale social events.

Not only does Stonewall represent an event which is convenient to study because it preceded a period of rapid escalation, but it has important implications for the Bowers and Ochs theory, because, from all accounts, it was spontaneous or non-strategic. Stonewall serves as

evidence that social movements may not always be the self-controlling, strategic entities that we typically see them as being, but that movements may need events such as Stonewall to facilitate escalation at times. Strategic theories such as Bowers and Ochs would then have to be modified to account for these catalytic events.

In examining the escalation of strategies, this study procedes chronologically. This paper has been criticized on this point. However, there is no other realistic way to proceed. This study is intended to see how well the Bowers and Ochs' schema fits when applied to an actual occurence of agitation. This involves the description of the group's activities, as reflected in their rhetoric, at every point in time at which behaviors are seen as distinct, the notation of the order in which these behaviors occurred, and the application of the established definitions to the behaviors to judge the appropriateness of the definitions. This process could result in: (1) modification of the definitions, (2) addition or deletion of strategies, (3) modification of the defined order or even of the idea of order to the strategies.

Only through the application of this process to many individual cases may the theory be developed so that it is raised "to the highest possible level of generalization" while at the same time conforming most closely to the facts.[13] To attempt the process any other way, one has to start with the theory, but that approach presumes the conclusion. As Ralph White notes, "Any pre-established psychological structure [e.g. a theory such as Bowers and Ochs] tends to impose itself on subsequent perception even when it is not appropriate."[14] If the Bowers and Ochs' theory comports with the facts, a chronological sequence should be the same as moving from strategy to strategy. If the theory deviates, then this deviation should be exposed and the theory modified rather than imposing the theory and modifying the facts.

The Rhetoric of Mattachine Midwest

Petition

Mattachine Midwest bills itself as a "non-profit, non sectarian Illinois corporation. Through its active program, it seeks to improve the legal, social and economic status of homosexuals. Membership is open to anyone 18 years of age or over, regardless of sex or sexual orientation."[15] In the July, 1967 issue of the Newsletter, there is evidence of the inception of a move toward increased radicalization. Mattachine Modwest is in the state of petition, the use of "normal discursive means of persuasion."[16] In one article in the newsletter, Mattachine Midwest reveals that one of its specific concerns is the abuse of loitering laws for the harassment of homosexuals and that one of its tactics in fulfilling its above stated function will be a test case in court.[17]

It is interesting that, at this point in time, one possible tactic of petition not used by Mattachine Midwest is involvement in the political arena. In the October, 1967 issue of the Newsletter, it is stated: "It is not the policy of Mattachine Midwest to lobby in any sense of the word."[18] Involvement in politics did not occur until March, 1969 when Mattachine Midwest decided to use the special aldermanic elections for

"getting its feet wet in political action."[19]

In 1967, Mattachine Midwest was only in its third year, and its concerns seemed to involve very basic issues of changing society's view of the homosexual more than issues of political concern. One of the basic tactics was to present the homosexual as an ideal citizen, absolutely conforming to society's norms in every way but sexual orientation. A dialog between a reader of the Newsletter and the editorial staff offers a synopsis of what the organization's stance was at the time. The following are excerpts from the dialog:

> Why the sanctimonious tone of so much of the Newsletter lately? From reading some of the views expressed, which presumably are individual opinions, one might think that homosexuals were supposed to apologize to the world, especially policemen, for existing. You would also get the impression that one of our major problems was that of somehow coping with the millions who camp madly in the streets and can't keep their hands off their fellow man.
>
> . . .
>
> The homosexual counterpart of the Uncle Tom is the Aunt Sally, and that is precisely what a homophile publication should not become.
>
> Although we must maintain honesty, can we cease condemning ourselves (At least in what appears to be an offidal manner) and direct attention to our real problems and aspirations?
>
> W.B.K.[20]

Excerpt from the editor's reply:

> We appreciate the fact that this letter is sincerely meant as constructive criticism.
>
> Much of that which W.B.K. has to say has merit. However, there are honest differences of opinion as to how we are to go about achieving our common aims.
>
> In reply to his letter, we have devoted the first page of this Newsletter to stating our attitudes relative to content of this publication.[21]

The first page referred to in the editor's reply was a statement of sixteen principles which generated a great deal of controversy, and were important in shaping the thought of the organization at the time. These principles are paraphrased in appendix A. Later articles in the Newsletter reacted to them.

While the strategy of petition continued to be in evidence throughout the evolution of the movement during the period studied, it was the only strategy in evidence in the early period studied. According to the Bowers and Ochs definition, the group, at this time, was not an agitative

group.[22] The overall temper of the Newsletter confirms that the group w would not conform to popular conceptions of a.tation, since its emphasis was largely on social functions and in-group educational efforts.

Promulgation

The incipience of strategies which would make the group agitative did not occur until May, 1968. This issue of the Newsletter carried the results of the new election of officers, and the note from the new president, Jim Bradford, addressed itself to some of the issues of concern in earlier Newsletter issues and set a new, bolder tone for the group. Bradford disclaims the stand taken in the publication of the sixteen principles referred to above. He labels the philosophy that the behavior of homosexuals must be better than anyone else's because they are seeking their rights "the Uncle Tom approach."[23] Bradford's approach is not to beg for rights, but to "demand equality of treatment from the heterosexual community."[24]

By the publication of the July and August Newsletter, Bradford escalated the group's strategies to the level of promulgation, including "all those tactics designed to win social support for the agitator's position. Among these Tactics, employed by almost all agitators, are informational picketing, erection of posters, and distribution of handbills and leaflets."[25] One of the primary concerns of this strategy is exploitation of the mass media.[26] In this issue of the Newsletter, Bradford made an appeal designed to escalate activities of promulgation. Bradford talked of rocking the boat for change in contrast to the earlier stance of the organization, and asked for people "of dedication who are willing to stick their necks out, walk the picket line, go on radio and television, and even get arrested if need be to bring equality to the homosexual in Chicago and the Middle West."[27]

Success in this strategy, especially as it concerns gaining access to the mass media, was predictably slow. Bowers and Ochs note the great difficulties involved for agitators to gain full and favorable attention in a system which is stacked against them.[28] This is probably especially As late as the early fifties, the word "homosexual" was literally banned from the pages of one of the country's most liberal newspapers, the New York Times.[29] Nevertheless, an example of Mattachine Midwest's success in this strategy was an article in the Chicago Sun-Times magazine section, Midwest, of December 14, 1969. The article was entitled "The Homosexuals, a Newly Visible Minority," and included interviews with Jim Bradford and other leaders of Mattachine Midwest.

Beyond the problem of limited media access, the success of promulgation was contingent upon overcoming another problem from within the group. The capacity for anonymity in the homophile movement, noted earlier, can prove to be a dubious advantage when seeking spokesmen for the movement. Society in effect rewards the homosexual who conceals his identity while those who are "out" risk discrimination in jobs, housing, and other societal functions, often with legal sanction. This unique characteristic probably accounts for the practically simultaneous, almost inverted occurrence of the strategies of solidification and polarization in the situation under examination.

Polarization

The first clear instance of polarization is in a note from Jim Bradford in the May, 1968 Newsletter.[30] His statement illustrates the basic assumption of polarization, that "anyone individual who has not committed himself in one way or another to the agitation is supportive of the establishment."[31]

The first signs of solidification, as Bowers and Ochs define it, did not occur until the following January with a change in the Newsletter banner. This will be discussed in the section dealing with solidification. What is important here is that polarization occurred first and, from this point, polarization and solidification were virtually simultaneous strategies. This has implications for the conception in the Bowers and Ochs schema of cumulative and progressive which will be discussed later.

The most important single instance of polarization is an essay by Bradford in the October, 1969 issue of the Newsletter entitled "The Homosexual as Nigger." This was just months after the Stonewall rebellion, and a radicalization of the homophile movement was beginning. "The Homosexual as Nigger," was both a general piece devoted to polarization and a piece with the specific aim of gaining alliance with activities Bradford outlined in another article in the same issue, "The New Militancy Emerges." In the latter, Bradford set the stage for the escalation of strategies. While he talked of a "new stamp of militancy," Bradford encouraged members to get back on the track of implementing the "lofty statement of purpose" in the by-laws.[32]

"The Homosexual as Nigger," is a massive attempt to create active support for the "new militancy" through polarization. One prominent tactic evident is the use of Flag issues,[33] particularly those concerning the police in Chicago:

> It boils down to this: The police in this city act like lower-middle-class slobs when they deal with gay people, black people, brown people, and any other visible minority when they think they can get away with it. You as a "queer" are as hated and disgusting as your blackest brother. Dig this, and the battle is already half won. Join us and contribute to MM as if you meant it, and the battle is 90% won.[34]

Another important tactic of polarization for the homophile movement seems to be "the invention of derogatory jargon for establishment groups," which includes members of the minority who are pro-establishment or uncommitted.[35] "The Homosexual as Nigger," uses the analog of "house niggers" and field niggers" to point out the difference between the homosexuals conception of his role in society and what his role is in reality:

> In the days of slavery, the "house nigger" was a favorite slave who was permitted to live and work in the master's house, as opposed to the "field nigger" who was obliged to live in a shack and do hard labor in the fields.

> One of the homosexual's most serious problems is his own unconscious identification with the "house nigger." He considers himself as a law-abiding, respectable citizen, believing in law and order, and perhaps a bit self-righteous about his "superior" middle-class (or better) status.
>
> We are all really "field niggers," and we had damn well better quit kidding ourselves about this status and band together to fight like hell to win our rightful place in the sun. . . [36]

A subtle, but extremely important precedent to these appeals was the decrease in anonymity in the Newsletter. Unlike early issues, the Newsletter began to publish the names of officers and staff, and more and more signed articles appeared to replace the precedent of initials or entirely anonymous contributions.

Solidification

Bradford's "new stamp of militancy" did not suddenly occur with the October issue of the Newsletter. The change had been gradual. The transition of the group from non-agitative to almost militant can be traced by considering the evolution of the Newsletter cover as manifesting the strategy of solidification. Four distinct stages in the evolution of the cover are presented in appendix B. The covers show the creation of a symbol which is well designed, simple, easily reproducible in posters, cartoons, sculptures, and medallions, and has a natural relationship to the things it represents.[37] The January, 1969 issue first displayed the interlocking symbol for male, accurately reflecting the constituency of the homophile movement in general and of the Mattachine Midwest specifically.[38] March, 1969 saw both the interlocked symbols for male and female become part of the regular banner where they remained in one form or another through the period studied.

Another aspect of the changing banner is the reflection of slogans: "Gay is Good," "Gay Power," "Buy Gay," and "Come Out." These slogans first appeared on the March, 1970 Newsletter, about nine months after the Stonewall rebellion.[39]

Solidification occurred concurrently with increased public exposure and militancy. After the Stonewall rebellion, there were rallys, marches, pamphleting, and other activities.[40] Some of the biggest demonstrations of the decade occurred on the first anniversary of the Stonewall rebellion. Nora Sayre, a reporter who covered the anti-war protests and the Democratic National Convention in 1968, described the New York commemoration of Stonewall's first anniversary as one of the most radical events she had covered.[41] Chicago's celebration was organized by the Chicago Gay Liberation, a group which was formed only since Stonewall, and endorsed by Mattachine Midwest.[42]

Politicization

Part of this increased public exposure and militancy was expressed through the involvement of the group in political matters. As mentioned in the discussion of petition, Mattachine Midwest chose to involve itself

in the aldermanic elections of March, 1969. The actual activity of the organization in this election is not described, but it apparently involved a questionaire to the candidates on issues especially pertinent to homosexuals. This tactic was repeated in August, 1969 in the election of delegates to the Illinois constitutional convention.[43]

As "a normal discursive means of persuasion," involvement in politics would be defined by Bowers and Ochs as a tactic of petition. The case I am presenting here for politicization as a separate strategy is a two-fold argument: (1) its chronological independence from petition and (2) a distinct difference in tone evidenced in the rhetoric between petition and politization. The latter is a qualitative judgment and is difficult to substantiate. Nevertheless, the difference between the tone expressed in the earlier Newsletters (see appendix A) and later Newsletters as evidenced in many of the above excerpts, is quite pronounced. In the same issue of the Newletter in which Mattachine Midwest announced its first political involvement, a reader notes the change in tenor:

> Sir: The tone of the Newsletter, the past several issues, is very definitely upgraded. Camp still permeates -- and why not? But there is just as much thoughtfulness in it. Thank God. After all, homos can think, can't they? I mean, for every dizzy queen who thinks "Get you, Mary" is wit, there is another who knows it could be the vice squads slogan.
>
> E.S., Chicago[44]

If this separateness in time and tone indicates that perhaps certain other strategies had to be worked through before political involvement, then politicization shoudl be considered a separate strategy with its own tactics: questioning candidates, voting drives, creating voting blocks, creating political issues, and voter education to name a few.

Coalition

The relationship of the homophile movement in general and of Mattachine Midwest in particular to other oppressed and minority groups began toemerge as an issue during this period of political involvement. In its earliest form, links were made via comparison. Various issues of the Newsletter contained implicit and explicit comparisons of the homophile movement to other movements, espcially black civil rights.

A more radical manifestation of this strategy is the alliance of a group with the causes of other groups. This marks an important issue in the rhetoric of Mattachine Midwest and is believed to be representative of the national homophile movement as well as other movements.[45] The first mention of alliance occured in a report of the 1969 NACHO (North American Conference of Homophile Organizations) noting a movement to identify NACHO with support of the New Left "on the draft, military policies, and other subjects not deemed by the majority of delegates to be properly homophile concerns, although perhaps vital subjects in their own right."[46] Both sides of this issue were addressed several times in the Newsletter. Perhaps the best articulation of the issue was a piece called "People Power" which urged identification with other

oppressed groups, including women, blacks, Spanish Americans, Indians, and poor whites, because "No minority will get equality until everybody has it."[47]

Coalition was an issue within Mattachine Midwest and was also a primary factor in the founding of a new group in Chicago, the Homophile Liberation Allaince. "composed mostly of young liberal/radical homosexuals/bisexuals."[48] In an announcement quoted by Mattachine Midwest, the group publicized a committment to identify itself with all oppressed peoples and to take definite positions on "all matters which affect our community as well as the heterosexual majority."[49]

Non-violent Resistance

Chicago Gay Liberation was part of the national Gay Liberation segment of the homophile movement characterized by this "New Left" mentality which found its beginnings in the events at Stonewall. It is significant that only a year after their founding, Gay Liberation, in addition to advocating alliances with other oppressed groups, was sponsoring events like the celebration in Chicago which included teach-ins, a dance, a march, and a rally "where real wooden closets may be burned . . ."[50] while the older Mattachine is still pursuing less advanced strategies, only endorsing the new group.

Whether the activities of Gay Liberation should be considered under the strategy of non-violent resistance, like "sit-ins, school boycotts, rent strikes, and the like,"[51] or whether they more appropriately belong to the strategy of promulgation is a difficult question. In part, this is because of ambiguity in the definition of non-violent resistance. Bowers and Ochs include civil disobedience as an integrally related concept to non-violent resistance. "Non-violent resistance is not always civilly disobedient, but it often is. When it is not, the agitators are violating custom rather than law."[52] What constitutes the violation of a custom?

Homosexuals almost invariably violate custom when acting on behalf of homosexuals. While, today, a march, in and of itself, may not be considered a violation of custom if blacks or women or students are marching, when gays march, people's reactions clearly indicate that custom, at the minimum, is being violated. Suzannah Lessard's report on the Gay Liberation of June, 1970 in New York illustrates this beautifully:

> "Oh no, not the fairies too!" said a woman watching the Gay Liberation movement march up Sixth Avenue last June, with a quizzical, good-humored expression on her face, as though they were so many puppies. "I'm from Ohio. I think it's funny," said a tourist. "I'd like to kick the shit out of them," said a clean, tense young man turning on his heel. No one knew how to react. Few grasped the implications or viewed it as more than either a circus or an abomination.[53]

Not only do they violate custom, but homosexuals have violated laws in expressing their sexuality long before there was any movement. In

1961, Illinois became the first state in the union to remove acts acts associated with homosexual sex from its criminal code. Before this time, most acts of homosexual sex were prohibited in every state under vaguely worded "sodomy laws." Although the statutes, using phrases like "crime against nature," apply equally to heterosexual activity which deviates from the prescribed norm, they are used almost exclusively against homosexuals.[54] Where sexual acts by homosexuals are clearly in violation of state laws, the vidations lack the necessary imposition on the public consciousness that is implicit in the strategy of non-violent resistance. In other words, the establishment has not been forced to suppress the violation of these laws. Consequently, there is not enough public awareness of the laws or enough feeling of their injustice to create a demand for change.[55] In all probability, the intent of the sodomy law violations has not been primarily to force establishment action. If that has been the intent, it has certainly failed as an example of non-violent resistance as a strategy.

Escalation/Confrontation

The issue of intent is important, for the next strategy, escalation/confrontation, is defined in terms of intent. Escalation/confrontation, in Bowers and Ochs' terms, assumes that the purpose of a particular activity is to create a reaction, hopefully overreaction, on the part of the establishment.[56] The ambiguity in deciding this issue becomes apparent in a report of a Chicago Gay Liberation dance in the May, 1970 issue of the Newsletter. The ostensible purpose of the dance was to provide a good time and increase morale in the gay community, to create an atmosphere of "gay self-affirmation."[57]

> The third Chicago Gay Liberation dance, held at the Coliseum on April 18, introduced freedom as the remedy that will end the closet as a way of life. The faggots came out for their public, the band was great, the vibes were beautiful. It did a lot for all of us.[58]

There are indications, however, that the expressed intent was not the only one. The article cited above mentioned the rumors of a raid which had circulated. Gay Liberation had prepared for this contingency by having a corp of lawyers, law students, and press in attendance:

> Some people didn't come for fear of a raid. Rumors were around that the vice were ready to bust everyone in sight. Gay Lib members were prepared to fight it out in court. Alert lawyers pressured the vice pitilessly (it can be done). Lawyers and law students were at the dance as witnesses; so was the press. A struggle was imminent if they raided. They didn't.[59]

These precautions clearly indicate an anticipation of establishment reaction to the event. Does this indicate that the expressed purpose for holding the event is not the true or even the primary purpose? This question cannot be adequately answered even using an in-group publication. It is not unreasonable to speculate that this is a generalizable problem.

Bowers and Ochs illuminate the reason behind this problem when they note the need for a group to maintain a certain respectability with the public. In the case of escalation/confrontation this is particularly true, for overreaction on the part of the establishment is only overreaction if the public perceives it as such. If a dissident group gives any hint that its purpose in pursuing a certain activity is to create this overreaction, and if the public becomes aware of this, then any establishment action, no matter how extreme, is viewed as just what the dissidents deserved. With the problem of unintended audiences (e.g. the now famous F.B.I. files from the sixties), it is doubtful that any group could risk stating any goal of escalation/confrontation even within the group. Therefore, there would be no rhetorical evidence of such intentions. Unless the critic is prepared to distinguish between real and stated goals, then, it becomes questionable as to whether escalation/confrontation is a valid strategy for the rhetorical critic to study. Nor can the problem be solved on the basis of outcome, for the establishment may react (or fail to react) to events in ways totally unexpected and unintended by the group.

Gandhi and Guerilla

If escalation/confrontation is not the province of the student of rhetoric because of lack of evidence within his/her domain, Gandhi and Guerilla is not a valid area of investigation by definition.[60] In this case study, this was not an issue, since, as in Weber's study, the escaltion did not proceed this far.[61]

Discussion

Looking back at the criterion set forth in the introduction, that if the Bowers and Ochs schema is completely valid for this particular study, a chronological analysis will result in a description of the original strategies in their prescribed order, we find that Bowers and Ochs have done very well. The schema is largely intact. There are, however, some potentially important deviations.

Two strategies are argued for which are not part of the original Bowers and Ochs theory, politicization and coalition. It is not completely clear where these two strategies fit into the sequence of the Bowers and Ochs schema, although the sequence which appeared in this study does not seem entirely unreasonable. A logical relationship could be posited between the occurence of these strategies and the events which preceded them.

Whether this logical relationship really exists is another question. This study does not lend complete support to the "cumulative and progressive" idea. Bowers and Ochs state that this should not be a rigid concept noting that it is not perfect, "depending on the actual and potential membership of agitation, the power and ideological strength of control, and the rhetorical sophistication of both agitation and control."[62] This study demonstrates how these factors become crucial in determining the order and occurrence of strategies. This was especially prominent in the near inversion of solidification and polarization.

The problem is compounded when strategies cannot be reliably typed. A case in point is escalation/confrontation. The nature of escalation/confrontation is to take offensive action while seeming to remain in a defensive posture. Doubt is raised that this is a strategy which can be defined using rhetorical evidence.

The two questions, when taken together, force an examination of the value of the cumulative and progressive idea beyond the most general statement of direction. As an analytical tool, its reliability is limited, attested to by both theoretical statement and case examination. As an unreliable instrument applied to events with nebulous definitions, it could lead to classification of events on a purely chronological basis or on the basis of order with thorough investigation into their nature.

In understanding social movements, the Bowers and Ochs' schema is limited in two additional areas. First, it does not deal with the role of formal organizations in the escalation of strategies. One of the potentially important findings of this study is that, while the movement as a whole covered a certain range of strategies in a reasonably predictable order, this was not true of a single organization. Mattachine Midwest covered only a limited number of strategies at the lower end of the scale. The more radical, visible events were the efforts of Gay Liberation groups who apparently picked up where Mattachine left off, skipping the initial stages of agitation, even though the two groups shared no formal history.[63]

The second area of limitation is the lack of consideration of non-strategic influences on movements and their strategies. A case in point is the Stonewall rebellion. All of the evidence points to a causal relationship between Stonewall and escalation of strategies and the inception of Gay Liberation. The Bowers and Ochs schema does not account for the ability or necessity of such events to escalate strategic activity, nor does it posit any apttern for escalation which follows such events. For example, in its physical manifestation, the Stonewall rebellion most closely conforms to the tactic of token violence under the strategy of escalation/confrontation. While it had tremendous impact on the movement as a whole, on the escalation of strategies, and on the formation of the Gay Liberation groups, the incident at the Stonewall Inn did not cause strategies to escalate progressively from the point of token violence.

Stonewall is not an isolated incident. When Rosa Parks refused to give up her seat on the bus in Montgomery, it was not a plan on the part of civil rights leaders to incite action. It was the spontaneous act of a woman who was tired, hot, and fed up with bowing, scraping, and being pushed around. The boycott which followed led in a new era in the struggle for black rights. Every movement has had events which occurred either outside the movement or spontaneously within the movement which dramatically shaped the future course of the movement. These events and their relationship to the movement need to be examined for the insights they provide, but they cannot be considered within the limited framework of strategies.

In spite of problems and limitations, the Bowers and Ochs' schema of strategies for agitation is basically a good one. In this case study, it accounts for most of the rhetorical activity of Mattachine Midwest. It also posits a reasonable escalation of activity from conservative to more radical, although this should be taken in a general sense and not with a rigid progression of strategies.

Some rhetorical activities were not accounted for by the hierarchy. To the extent that there is evidence that these may be typical of other movements, these areas warrant further investigation.

In part, the instances of lack of conformity to the Bowers and Ochs' theory may be a function of the homophile movement as a unique employer of rhetorical strategies. Even if this is the case, the theory has not been tested enough to make these distinctions, and hence, there are indications of the necessity of applying qualifiers to the theory.

It is the general adequacy of the theory which makes it worth the kind of effort advocated by Weber and again here. Albert J. Croft, in an oft-cited essay, claims that one of three functions of rhetorical research, "in addition to historical interpretation and critical evaluation, is to modify or add to rhetorical theory itself."[64] Ultimately, the value of the field of rhetoric, as is true with any field, depends on the value of its theories. In our existential age where man see himself individually as impotent and resorts to collective behavior more and more often to achieve his goals, a theory such as Bowers and Ochs present has tremendous potential utility. To realize its potential, however, it must be modified, qualified, and refined. We must seek to maximize its applicability while strictly defining its limits.

Appendix A

1. Homosexuals must establish good rapport with parents, opposite sex, world at large.
2. Homosexuals are not special characters and have no special rights
3. Minority groups must make sacrifices to gain equal rights (to which all are entitled).
4. Law enforcement should protect and enforce, not harass.
5. Most homosexuals are equally law abiding as heterosexuals.
6. No one has the right to "carry on" indiscreetly or compulsively.
7. Homosexuals should not have to apologize, except when they infringe (their homosexuality infringes) on the rights of others.
8. No concrete evidence that homosexuality is an illness or hereditary exists.
9. Ignorance and misunderstanding makes homosexuality a social problem.
10. Society judges all homosexuals by the behavior of the most overt minority.
11. Rejection by society is a major problem for homosexuals.
12. Being forced to live two lives is difficult.
13. The difference between homosexuals and heterosexuals is only sexual preference.
14. Homosexuals react to the same sex exactly as a heterosexual does to the opposite sex.
15. Homosexuals are not interested in seducing non-homosexuals.
16. It is our job to remind the public of these attitudes and to chastise all who ignore them for selfish reasons or in ignorance.

Appendix B

The following banner pages of the Mattachine Midwest Newsletter contain an excellent example of solidification in the evolution of the logo. The May, 1968 cover is typical of all of the early Newsletters used in this study until January, 1969 when the banner was changed as noted in the text. Except for the two symbols, for both male and female, which first appeared in March, 1969, the banner between March, 1969 and March, 1970 varied. The November-December, 1969 issue is a representative cover of the period. The last two entries are the first editions to appear with their respective new logos, the one appearing on the June, 1970 issue remaining constant for the duration of those issues examined in the study. It is interesting to observe how the issues with which the Newsletter is concerned evolve along with the solidification strategy.

HOMOSEXUAL PUBLICATIONS —— MATTACHINE MIDWEST NEWSLETTER 1965-71

MATTACHINE Midwest NEWSLETTER

MAY 1968

PUBLIC MEETING

Mr. George C. Pontikes, Chicago attorney and member of the board of directors of the American Civil Liberties Union, will be our speaker at the open meeting on May 23. Mr. Pontikes is widely recognized as an authority on the Federal Civil Service and the Selective Service Act.

We have had many inquiries from members and friends concerning their rights with respect to the draft. This program ought to attract a large attendance and answer some questions. Let your friends know about the meeting. Everyone is welcome, and refreshments will be served at 10 o'clock, following the discussion period.

DATE: Thursday, May 23, 8 PM

PLACE: American Civil Liberties Union, 4th floor, 6 S. Clark St.

RESERVE THESE DATES (places to be announced later):

May 23	Aug. 22	Nov. 21
June 27	Sep. 26	Dec. 26
July 25	Oct. 24	

VERTICAL FILE

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

INSTITUTE FOR SEX RESEARCH, INC.

MAY 15 1968

H. PUBLIC. INST. TRCHNE MIDWEST - NEWSLETTER 1969-71

MATTACHINE MIDWEST
NEWSLETTER
NOV.- DEC. 1969

DOCTORS AND NIMH URGE LAW CHANGE

by M. J. Kuda

The results of two studies of interest to the homophile community have received local and national news coverage. The final report of the Task Force on Homosexuality, sponsored by the National Institute of Mental Health, and a poll on sociomedical issues, including homosexuality, conducted by Modern Medicine magazine, concluded that homosexual acts between consenting adults "if they are carried out discreetly" are not matters of public or legal concern.

Of the 27,700 doctors responding to the Modern Medicine poll, the percentage of physicians specializing in psychiatry who were in favor of legalizing homosexual acts was significantly higher than the total poll result—92% versus 67.7%.

The NIMH's "Hooker Report" (after its chairman, UCLA's Dr. Evelyn Hooker), while advocating further research into the non-clinical aspects of homosexuality in our society, emphasized the necessity for the review and revamping of existing legal policy and employment practices.

Both studies stressed that their conclusions were well ahead of general public reaction but anticipated gradual changes in society's attitudes. [The Harris Poll's survey of public attitudes is reported on page 3 of this issue.] Illinois has had a "consensual" law on the books since 1961 and thus should be in the forefront of implementing the balance of proposed reforms recommended by the Task Force. These reports can be ammunition in the militant homophile's arsenal. Thinking men will find them conclusive. As Newsweek commented, the homosexual no longer demands "simple privacy, but full legal, economic and social integration."

TIME's clock runs backward

See VALERIE TAYLOR's article, Page 14

INSTITUTE FOR SEX RESEARCH, INC.

DEC 10 1969

VERTICAL FILE

H.-PUB-MATTACHINE MIDWEST NEWSLETTER 1969-71

MATTACHINE MIDWEST NEWSLETTER

COME OUT · GAY IS GOOD · BUY GAY · GAY POWER · GAY LIB

MARCH 1970

Newsletter editor David Stienecker was arrested at home on Saturday morning, Feb. 7, by Youth Division Cop John Manley, about whom David had written a humorous article that appeared in our September 1969 issue. The "crime" charged is criminal defamation (Ch. 38, Art. 27-1, Illinois Revised Statutes).

Manley entered the building, got Stienecker out of bed, and proceeded to arrest him without exhibiting a warrant. He said that one was on file at the police station. When Stienecker expressed doubts about the invisible warrant, Manley used David's phone to call a paddy wagon, but refused to permit David to use his own phone to notify anyone of the arrest.

After being held 4 hours for "processing" at the Foster Ave. police station, David was permitted to post his own $25 bond and was released intact.

—EDITOR ARRESTED—

This arrest marks the first case we are aware of in which an official of a homophile organization has been arrested for writing an article. (Shades of clear and present danger!) In issuing a statement after Stienecker's release, MM President Jim Bradford stated, "We try to alert both the homosexual community and police officials to over-zealous officers who make needless arrests . . . Manley's contempt for freedom of the press and other constitutional guarantees should draw condemnation from all quarters." The article and other news notes about Manley should have clued in our own community as well as those alert police brass who do read our Newsletter that trouble was brewing in the park. We thought the Constitution meant what it says about freedom of speech, press, assembly and the petition for redress of grievances.

Stienecker is in fine fighting spirits. Constitutional law experts are being consulted. The American Civil Liberties Union has agreed to enter the case. David's trial is set for Friday, Mar. 6, at 9:30 a.m. in the Magistrate's court in the Chicago Ave. police station, 116 W. Chicago Ave., 2d floor.

MM's Board is calling for massive community support for the defense, which is our defense as well as David's. Contributions to the legal defense fund will help fight the battle. General contributions, always welcome, will help beef up Mattachine Midwest to continue to do our thing and more effectively challenge the injustices of the social order. Why not contribute and show up at the hearing to show your support?

INSTITUTE FOR SEX RESEARCH, INC. FEB 24 1970

VF

MM

JUNE 1970

MATTACHINE MIDWEST NEWSLETTER

HOMOSEXUALITY - GAY LIBERATION - NEWSLETTERS - 1969-71

VERTICAL FILE

"GAY PRIDE WEEK" JUNE 21-28

Homosexual Chicagoans will join their counterparts [illegible] celebrating Gay Pride Week in late June, when the first anniversary of the [illegible] of the Gay Liberation movement will be observed.

On Christopher Street Liberation Day, June 28, 1969, thousands of gay people and sympathizers poured into the streets of New York City's Greenwich Village in protest against heavy-handed police tactics in arresting patrons of the Stonewall Inn, a popular but unlicensed gay bar on Christopher Street that was being closed by authorities. By coincidence of warm weather, the very gay neighborhood, the taste of freedom afforded in recent years by Mayor Lindsay's relaxation of gay repression, changing social attitudes toward sex, growing alienation and militancy by youth, the impact of the black civil rights revolution's example, and probably a dozen other factors, the outrage of the Stonewall patrons carried over into several nights of street confrontations with police and led to the formation of the New York Gay Liberation Front.

Although the beginnings of Gay Liberation had already been seen in Berkeley and San Francisco, the single historical event of the Christopher Street riots has come to be seen as the "official" start of Gay Liberation, a movement that has since spread to Kalamazoo and Carbondale, Kansas City and Milwaukee, as well as Los Angeles, Chicago and points in between.

Chicago's celebration, organized by Chicago Gay Liberation and endorsed by Mattachine Midwest (members of both will participate), will include:

+A Lake Michigan cruise on Sunday, June 21 (see page 7);

+A giant rally on Saturday, June 27, 12 noon at Pughouse Square (the site symbolizing the secrecy and repression of the past), where real wooden closets may be burned, followed by a march past the Chicago Avenue police station (again symbolic), the Lawson YMCA (more symbolism), to the grassy plaza of the Water Tower and Michigan Avenue, connoting gay persons' new openness and seizure of their own rightful place in society;

+A dance at the Aragon Ballroom on Sunday, June 28, 7 to midnight;

+Teach-ins, a Midwestern Gay Lib conference, and other events.

Informational leaflets on all events will be circulated throughout June by Gay Liberation and MM. The result should be the biggest outpouring of gay self-affirmation Chicago has ever seen.

WILLIAM B. KELLEY

CHARGES DROPPED AGAINST EDITOR

(Newsletter editor David Stienecker was charged by Sgt. John Manley of the Chicago Police Department with criminal defamation as the result of an article by Stienecker in the September 1969 issue, in which Stienecker dealt with numerous arrests by Manley in Lincoln Park washrooms.)

On May 6, attorney Renee Hanover and I went back to court for the fourth time. We went through the same hassle of convincing the court we were supposed to be there and were indeed in the right courtroom. The judge seemed to believe that we were wrong, explaining to us that he only tried civil cases, and asked if we were the paternity suit he had that day. Finally, after waiting for an hour or so, the case came up. As usual, Manley wasn't there. In fact, he had never showed up except for the first appearance. We approached the bench, and Mrs. Hanover presented a motion for dismissal on the grounds that the complaint

(continued on page 4)

First with new banner!

INSTITUTE FOR SEX RESEARCH, INC

JUN 8 1970

Footnotes

*The author owes a debt to the selection committee for their valuable criticisms in preparing the final draft of this paper, to Prof. Charles Stewart of Purdue for his editorial assistance, and to Ms. Joan Brewer and the staff of the Institute for Sex Research Library, Indiana University, Bloomington.

[1]John Waite Bowers and Donovan J. Ochs, The Rhetoric of Agitation and Control (Reading, Ma.: Addison-Wesley, 1971).

[2]Wayne H. Weber, "Strategies of Agitation and Control: Predictive Utility in Conflict Resolution," Paper Presented to the Central States Speech Association Conference, April 2, 1976, Chicago, Il.

[3]Ibid., 13.

[4]The control strategies have been ignored here in order to give greater depth in considering agitation.

[5]Joseph J. Hayes, "Gayspeak," Quarterly Journal of Speech, 62 (October, 1976), 256-266.

[6]James W. Chesebro and Caroline D. Hamsher, Orientations to Public Communication (Chicago: Science Research Associates, Inc., 1976); James W. Chesebro, John F. Cragan, and Patricia Mc Cullough, "The Small Group Techniques of the Radical-Revolutionary: A Synthetic Study of Consciousness Raising," Speech Monographs, 40 (June, 1973), 136-146; Robert L. Scott, "The Conservative Voice in Radical Rhetoric: A Common Response to Division," Speech Monographs, 40 (June, 1973), 123-135; James Chesebro, "Rhetorical Strategies of the Radical Revolutionary," Today's Speech, 20 (Winter, 1972), 37-44.

[7]For the results of various studies on attitudes toward homosexuality, see: Martin S. Weinberg and Colin J. Williams, Male Homosexuals: Their Problems and Adaptations (New York: Oxford University Press, 1974). Included in these results is the 1969 Harris poll which showed that 63 percent of Americans considered homosexuals harmful to American life.

[8]Alfred C. Kinsey, Wardell B. Pomeroy, and Clyde E. Martin, Sexual Behavior in the Human Male (Philadelphia: W. B. Saunders, 1948), 625.

[9]Arno Karlen, Sexuality and Homosexuality: A New View (New York: W.W. Norton and Co., 1971), xiii.

[10]Erving Goffman, Stigma: Notes on the Management of Spoiled Identity (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1963), 26.

[11]Bowers and Ochs, 20.

[12]Ibid.

[13]See Theodore Clevenger, Jr., "The Interaction of Descriptive and Experimental Research in the Development of Rhetorical Theory," reprinted in Douglas Ehninger (ed.), Contemporary Rhetoric (Glenview, Il.: Scott, Foresman, 1972), 174-178.

[14]Ralph K. White, Value-analysis: The Nature and Use of the Method, (Glen Gardiner, N.J.: Libertarian Press, 1951), 62.

[15]This is from the statement that appeared in all issues of the Mattachine Midwest Newsletter. I took this from the issue of July, 1969, page 9.

[16]Bowers and Ochs, 17.

[17]Mattachine Midwest Newsletter (July, 1967), 1.

[18]Mattachine Midwest Newsletter (October, 1967), 6.

[19]Mattachine Midwest Newsletter (March, 1969), 3.

[20]Mattachine Midwest Newsletter (August, 1969), 3.

[21]Mattachine Midwest Newsletter (July, 1967), 12.

[22]Bowers and Ochs, 17.

[23]Mattachine Midwest Newsletter (May, 1968), 5.

[24]Ibid.

[25]Bowers and Ochs, 17.

[26]Ibid., 18.

[27]Mattachine Midwest Newsletter (July and August, 1968), 2.

[28]Bowers and Ochs, 19.

[29]Edward Sagarin, Odd Man In: Societies of Deviants in America (Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1969), 78-79.

[30]Mattachine Midwest Newsletter (May, 1968), 12.

[31]Bowers and Ochs, 26.

[32]Jim Bradford, "The New Militancy Emerges," Mattachine Midwest Newsletter (October, 1969), 2.

[33]Bowers and Ochs, 27.

[34]Jim Bradford, "The Homosexual as Nigger," Mattachine Midwest Newsletter (October, 1969), 10.

[35]Bowers and Ochs, 28.

[36]Bradford, "The Homosexual as Nigger," 10.

[37]Bowers and Ochs, 22-24.

[38]Mattachine Midwest Newsletter (January, 1969), 1. The homophile movement in general and Mattachine Midwest in particular is dominated by males.

[39]Mattachine Midwest Newsletter (March, 1970), 1.

[40]See Mattachine Midwest Newsletter (August, 1969), 2 for a report of some of the events in New York.

[41]Nora Sayre, Sixties Going on Seventies (New York: Arbor House, 1973), 42.

[42]Mattachine Midwest Newsletter (June, 1970), 1.

[43]Mattachine Midwest Newsletter (August, 1969), 3.

[44]Mattachine Midwest Newsletter (August, 1969), 4.

[45]Scott mentions this phenomenon. "Combination with others may not be a necessary first step for the sufferer of oppressive division, but such cannot be delayed forever." Scott, 129.

[46]Mattachine Midwest Newsletter (September, 1969), 5.

[47]"People Power," Mattachine Midwest Newsletter (April, 1970), 4.

[48]"Chicago Gay Liberation Group Forms," Mattachine Midwest Newsletter, (November-December, 1969), 3.

[49]Ibid.

[50]Mattachine Midwest Newsletter (June, 1970), 1.

[51]Bowers and Ochs, 30

[52]Ibid., 32.

[53]Suzannah Lessard, "Gay is Good for us All," Washington Monthly, 2 (December, 1970), reprinted in Joseph A. McCaffrey (ed.), The Homosexual Dialectic (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1972), 205.

[54]For a discussion of this, see Martin Hoffman, The Gay World: Male Homosexuality and the Creation of Social Evil (New York: Basic Books, 1968), 77-111, Karlen, 607-618.

[55]Karlen cites only one case of public prosecution of a "private homosexual act between consenting adults" arousing enough public indignation to create a move to reform the law.

[56]Bowers and Ochs, 35-36. This strategy and all of the subsequent tactics are defined in terms of the establishment's expected reaction. The purpose of this strategy is to gain a specific reaction from the establishment.

[57]"Citywide Day-In at Coliseum," Mattachine Midwest Newsletter (May, 1970), 1.

[58]Ibid.

[59]Ibid.

[60]Bowers and Ochs, 36.

[61]Weber, 13.

[62]Bowers and Ochs, 17.

[63]It is not to be understood that the Chicago Gay Liberation was a spin-off group of malcontents from within Mattachine Midwest. The evidence indicates spearate constituencies for the most part. See: M.J. Kuda, "MM, Gay Lib Meet Jointly," Mattachine Midwest Newsletter (June, 1970), 4.

[64]Albert J. Croft, "The Functions of Rhetorical Criticism," Quarterly Journal of Speech, 42 (October, 1956), 290.